



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ml

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,938	03/31/2004	Avaneesh Dubey	11884/413901	4923
23838	7590	05/15/2007	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W. SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			WANG, BEN C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2192		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/812,938	DUBEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ben C. Wang	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 August 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(e)

The following is quotation of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) which form the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burke et al., (Pat. No. US 6,789,252 B1) (hereinafter ‘Burke’).
3. **As to claim 1**, Burke discloses a method comprising: (i) defining, in configuration data of a computer system (Fig. 33 – business object definition methodology configuration and implementation; Fig. 42 – how the Product Composition System can be used to create a typical composite specification configuration; Col. 38, Lines 30-32; Fig. 43; Col. 38, Lines 33-36; Fig. 49; Col. 16, Lines 53-57 – the choice among these categories is a matter of configuration by the user; Col. 16, Line 62 through Col. 17, Line 4; Fig. 29; Col. 29, Lines 22-24; Figs. 52-53), a business process in terms of what activities (Col. 6, Lines 25-26; Col. 17, Lines 24-30 – a view can be provided for each activity involved with the collection and derivation of specification content, and for each activity involved with the understanding or applied use of sub-view within the activities of the

business; Col. 53, Lines 1-41) the business process comprises; and (ii) defining, in the configuration data, a behavior of each activity of the business process with respect to a business object acted on by the business activity (Fig. 5, with contribution and behavior controlled by role; Col. 14, Lines 27-38; Col. 15, Lines 18-21; Col. 18, Lines 60-63; Col. 26, Lines 34-37; Col. 34, Lines 49-65; Col. 52, Col. 52, Lines 30-31; Col. 53, Lines 35-37), for a plurality of process control elements (Fig. 3, i.e., Schedule Processing, Tracking Progress; Fig. 41, Graphic 1 – Linking Specification Detail to Process Steps, Process Step CR...Process Step P2...; Col. 3, Lines 1-10; Col. 5, Lines 18-20; Col. 5, Lines 48-58 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface for the viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing said definitions/specifications) including a status element (Col. 23, Lines 33-38; Col. 48, Lines 14-41, i.e., the status of the counter changes to “withdrawn”; the status of the bid or counter changes to “rejected”; the status of the posting, bids, and counters changes to “expired”), a user interface element (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25), a plausibility check element (Fig. 10, Check Conformance; Fig. 43, Fig. 43, Capability Check;

Col. 9, Lines 56-58; Col. 19, Lines 21-26 – as well as compliance checking; Col. 23, Lines 25-29; Col. 23, Lines 44-47; Col. 32, Lines 17-22; Col. 35, Lines 11-15 – during the transfer, data is automatically validated), a release element (Col. 14, Lines 65-67; Col. 17, Lines 45-54 – applicabilities determine the participation of definition ingredients in a released revision of the object definition; Col. 22, Lines 1-7; Col. 21, Lines 33-36), and an authorization element (Col. 15, Line 22 – the process for authoring an Object Identity; Col. 41, Lines 42-47).

4. **As to claim 3,** Burke discloses a system comprising: a processor (Col. 30, Lines 6-9; Fig. 29; Col. 29, Lines 27-30; Col. 84, Line 4 – a processor programmed to); a memory (Fig. 29, element 113 – disk drive; Col. 29, Lines 37-40) coupled to the processor and storing instructions executable by the processor to configure business application software, the instructions implementing a method including: presenting an option to define a business process in terms of what activities the business process comprises (Col. 6, Lines 25-26; Col. 17, Lines 24-30 – a view can be provided for each activity involved with the collection and derivation of specification content, and for each activity involved with the understanding or applied use of sub-view within the activities of the business; Col. 53, Lines 1-41); based on user input, setting values in configuration data corresponding to a defined process (Fig. 33 – business object definition methodology configuration and implementation; Fig. 42 – how the Product Composition System can be used to create a typical composite specification configuration; Col. 38, Lines 30-32; Fig. 43; Col. 38, Lines 33-36;

Fig. 49; Col. 16, Lines 53-57 – the choice among these categories is a matter of configuration by the user; Col. 16, Line 62 through Col. 17, Line 4; Fig. 29; Col. 29, Lines 22-24; Figs. 52-53); presenting an option to define a behavior of each activity of the business process with respect to a business object for each of a plurality of process control elements (Fig. 3, i.e., Schedule Processing, Tracking Progress; Fig. 41, Graphic 1 – Linking Specification Detail to Process Steps, Process Step CR...Process Step P2...; Col. 3, Lines 1-10; Col. 5, Lines 18-20; Col. 5, Lines 48-58 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface for the viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing said definitions/specifications) including a status element (Col. 23, Lines 33-38; Col. 48, Lines 14-41, i.e., the status of the counter changes to “withdrawn”; the status of the bid or counter changes to “rejected”; the status of the posting, bids, and counters changes to “expired”), a user interface element (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25), a plausibility check element (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent

user interface for viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25), a release element (Col. 14, Lines 65-67; Col. 17, Lines 45-54 – applicabilities determine the participation of definition ingredients in a released revision of the object definition; Col. 22, Lines 1-7; Col. 21, Lines 33-36), and an authorization element (Col. 15, Line 22 – the process for authoring an Object Identity; Col. 41, Lines 42-47); and based on user input, setting values in the configuration data corresponding to a defined behavior (Fig. 5, with contribution and behavior controlled by role; Col. 14, Lines 27-38; Col. 15, Lines 18-21; Col. 18, Lines 60-63; Col. 26, Lines 34-37; Col. 34, Lines 49-65; Col. 52, Col. 52, Lines 30-31; Col. 53, Lines 35-37).

5. **As to claim 7,** Burke discloses a machine-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions to perform a method comprising: presenting an option to define a business process in terms of what activities the business process comprises (Col. 84, Lines 1-16 – a system for creating a computer-processable definition of a business object; Col. 6, Lines 25-26; Col. 17, Lines 24-30 – a view can be provided for each activity involved with the collection and derivation of specification content, and for each activity involved with the understanding or applied use of sub-view within the activities of the business; Col. 53, Lines 1-41); based on user input, setting values in configuration data

corresponding to a defined process (Fig. 33 – business object definition methodology configuration and implementation; Fig. 42 – how the Product Composition System can be used to create a typical composite specification configuration; Col. 38, Lines 30-32; Fig. 43; Col. 38, Lines 33-36; Fig. 49; Col. 16, Lines 53-57 – the choice among these categories is a matter of configuration by the user; Col. 16, Line 62 through Col. 17, Line 4; Fig. 29; Col. 29, Lines 22-24; Figs. 52-53); presenting an option to define a behavior of each activity of the business process with respect to a business object for each of a plurality of process control elements (Fig. 3, i.e., Schedule Processing, Tracking Progress; Fig. 41, Graphic 1 – Linking Specification Detail to Process Steps, Process Step CR...Process Step P2...; Col. 3, Lines 1-10; Col. 5, Lines 18-20; Col. 5, Lines 48-58 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface for the viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing said definitions/specifications) including a status element (Col. 23, Lines 33-38; Col. 48, Lines 14-41, i.e., the status of the counter changes to “withdrawn”; the status of the bid or counter changes to “rejected”; the status of the posting, bids, and counters changes to “expired”), a user interface element (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig.

68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25), a plausibility check element (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25), a release element (Col. 14, Lines 65-67; Col. 17, Lines 45-54 – applicabilities determine the participation of definition ingredients in a released revision of the object definition; Col. 22, Lines 1-7; Col. 21, Lines 33-36), and an authorization element (Col. 15, Line 22 – the process for authoring an Object Identity; Col. 41, Lines 42-47); and based on user input, setting values in the configuration data corresponding to a defined behavior (Fig. 5, with contribution and behavior controlled by role; Col. 14, Lines 27-38; Col. 15, Lines 18-21; Col. 18, Lines 60-63; Col. 26, Lines 34-37; Col. 34, Lines 49-65; Col. 52, Col. 52, Lines 30-31; Col. 53, Lines 35-37).

6. **As to claim 9,** Burke discloses a method comprising: reading configuration data to determine a behavior of a business activity with respect to a business object, wherein the behavior is defined in the configuration data in accordance with a plurality of process control elements (Fig. 3, i.e., Schedule Processing, Tracking Progress; Fig. 41, Graphic 1 – Linking Specification Detail

to Process Steps, Process Step CR...Process Step P2...; Col. 3, Lines 1-10; Col. 5, Lines 18-20; Col. 5, Lines 48-58 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface for the viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing said definitions/specifications) including a status element (Col. 23, Lines 33-38; Col. 48, Lines 14-41, i.e., the status of the counter changes to “withdrawn”; the status of the bid or counter changes to “rejected”; the status of the posting, bids, and counters changes to “expired”), a user interface element (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25), a plausibility check element (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25), a release element (Col. 14, Lines 65-67; Col. 17, Lines 45-54 – applicabilities determine the participation of definition ingredients in a released

revision of the object definition; Col. 22, Lines 1-7; Col. 21, Lines 33-36), and an authorization element (Col. 15, Line 22 – the process for authoring an Object Identity; Col. 41, Lines 42-47); and performing the business activity in accordance with the configuration data (Fig. 5, with contribution and behavior controlled by role; Col. 14, Lines 27-38; Col. 15, Lines 18-21; Col. 18, Lines 60-63; Col. 26, Lines 34-37; Col. 34, Lines 49-65; Col. 52, Col. 52, Lines 30-31; Col. 53, Lines 35-37).

7. **As to claim 2** (incorporating the rejection in claim 1), Burke discloses the method further comprising performing an activity of the business process in accordance with a corresponding defined behavior (Fig. 5, with contribution and behavior controlled by role; Col. 14, Lines 27-38; Col. 15, Lines 18-21; Col. 18, Lines 60-63; Col. 26, Lines 34-37; Col. 34, Lines 49-65; Col. 52, Col. 52, Lines 30-31; Col. 53, Lines 35-37).

8. **As to claim 4** (incorporating the rejection in claim 3), Burke discloses the system the method further comprising performing the business process or an activity thereof in accordance with the configuration data (Fig. 5, with contribution and behavior controlled by role; Col. 14, Lines 27-38; Col. 15, Lines 18-21; Col. 18, Lines 60-63; Col. 26, Lines 34-37; Col. 34, Lines 49-65; Col. 52, Col. 52, Lines 30-31; Col. 53, Lines 35-37).

9. **As to claim 5** (incorporating the rejection in claim 3), Burke discloses the system the method further comprising associating respective configuration values with retrieval parameters (Fig. 37-2, Retrieval Methods; Col. 25, Lines 28-31; Fig. 41; Col. 27, Lines 5-9; Col. 59, Lines 11-13).

10. **As to claim 6** (incorporating the rejection in claim 5), Burke discloses the system the method further comprising reading configuration values based on the retrieval parameters (Fig. 37-2, Retrieval Methods; Col. 25, Lines 28-31; Fig. 41; Col. 27, Lines 5-9; Col. 59, Lines 11-13), and controlling a behavior of the business process or an activity thereof based on the configuration values (Fig. 5, with contribution and behavior controlled by role; Col. 14, Lines 27-38; Col. 15, Lines 18-21; Col. 18, Lines 60-63; Col. 26, Lines 34-37; Col. 34, Lines 49-65; Col. 52, Col. 52, Lines 30-31; Col. 53, Lines 35-37)..

11. **As to claim 8** (incorporating the rejection in claim 7), Burke discloses the machine-readable medium, the method further comprising associating respective configuration values with retrieval parameters (Fig. 37-2, Retrieval Methods; Col. 25, Lines 28-31; Fig. 41; Col. 27, Lines 5-9; Col. 59, Lines 11-13).

12. **As to claim 10** (incorporating the rejection in claim 9), Burke discloses the method wherein values in the configuration data corresponding to the business activity are read based on a retrieval parameter (Fig. 37-2, Retrieval Methods; Col. 25, Lines 28-31; Fig. 41; Col. 27, Lines 5-9; Col. 59, Lines 11-13)

corresponding to a process control area of the business activity (Fig. 3, i.e., Schedule Processing, Tracking Progress; Fig. 41, Graphic 1 – Linking Specification Detail to Process Steps, Process Step CR...Process Step P2...; Col. 3, Lines 1-10; Col. 5, Lines 18-20; Col. 5, Lines 48-58 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface for the viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing said definitions/specifications).

13. **As to claim 11** (incorporating the rejection in claim 9), Burke discloses the method wherein the status element relates to a stage of a business process that includes the business activity (Col. 23, Lines 33-38; Col. 48, Lines 14-41, i.e., the status of the counter changes to “withdrawn”; the status of the bid or counter changes to “rejected”; the status of the posting, bids, and counters changes to “expired”).

14. **As to claim 12** (incorporating the rejection in claim 9), Burke discloses the method wherein the user interface element relates to at least one of an appearance and operability of a user interface for handling the business object (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that

enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25).

15. **As to claim 13** (incorporating the rejection in claim 9), Burke discloses the method wherein the plausibility check element relates to plausibility checks on data relating to the business object (Fig. 49, inbound product interfaces, inbound customer interfaces; Col. 4, Lines 17-28 – such a system must support end user creation of definitions/specifications through a consistent user interface fro viewing, understanding, exchanging, and processing such definitions/specifications; Col. 7, Lines 7-12 – this ontology definition drives a dynamic user interface that enables the user to create, extend and use ...; Fig. 68; Col. 12, Lines 6-7; Fig. 73; Col. 12, Lines 17-19; Col. 22, Lines 31-33; Col. 25, Lines 19-25).

16. **As to claim 14** (incorporating the rejection in claim 9), Burke discloses the method wherein the release element relates to an approval for the business object to be acted on by a subsequent activity (Col. 14, Lines 65-67; Col. 17, Lines 45-54 – applicabilities determine the participation of definition ingredients in a released revision of the object definition; Col. 22, Lines 1-7; Col. 21, Lines 33-36).

17. **As to claim 15** (incorporating the rejection in claim 9), Burke discloses the method wherein the authorization element relates to an authorization to act on

the business object (Col. 15, Line 22 – the process for authoring an Object Identity; Col. 41, Lines 42-47).

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- M. Blevins, Collaborative Business Plug-In Framework (Pub. No. US 2004/0221261 A1)
- M. K. Bowman-Amuah, System, Method and Article of Manufacture for A Persistent State and Persistent Object Separator In An Information Services Patterns Environment (Pat. No. US 6,442,748 B1)
- C. Sproule, System and Method for the Composition, Generation, Integration and Execution of Business Process over a Network (Pub. No. US 2004/0133876 A1)

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ben C. Wang whose telephone number is 571-270-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BCW *BW*

[Handwritten signature]
TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

May 7, 2007